```
N665kwoC
1
      UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
      SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW YORK
 2
 3
                                             New York, N.Y.
     UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,
                                             23 Cr. 118 (AT)
 4
                V.
5
     HO WAN KWOK,
     YANPING WANG,
6
                    Defendant.
 7
      -----x
 8
                                              June 6, 2023
9
                                              1:10 p.m.
10
     Before:
11
                           HON. ANALISA TORRES,
12
                                              U.S. District Judge
13
14
15
                                APPEARANCES
16
     DAMIAN WILLIAMS
          United States Attorney for the
17
          Southern District of New York
     BY: RYAN B. FINKEL
          JULIANA MURRAY
18
          MICAH FERGENSON
19
          Assistant United States Attorneys
20
     BROWN RUDNICK, LLP
          Attorneys for Defendant Kwok
21
     BY: STEPHEN COOK
     BY: NATASHA M. ERTZBISCHOFF
22
      CHAUDHRYLAW PLLC
23
          Attorneys for Defendant Wang
     BY: PRIYA CHAUDHRY
24
     ALSO PRESENT:
25
     DANIEL HARTENSTINE, Classified Information Security Officer
      BRENDA CHEN, Mandarin Interpreter
```

1 (In open court) THE COURT: Good afternoon. We are here in the matter 2 3 of the United States v. Ho Juan Kwok and Yangping Wang. 4 Would you make your appearances, please. 5 MR. FINKEL: Good afternoon, your Honor. Ryan Finkel, 6 Juliana Murray and Micah Fergenson for the government. We are 7 joined at counsel table by Geoffrey Mearns, who is a paralegal in our office. 8 9 MR. COOK: Good morning, your Honor. Stephen Cook and 10 Natasha Ertzbischoff on behalf of Ho Wan Kwok. 11 MS. CHAUDHRY: Good afternoon, your Honor. Priya 12 Chaudhry for Ms. Wang who is present and standing to my right. 13 THE COURT: And would the interpreter please identify 14 herself? 15 INTERPRETER: Good afternoon, your Honor. My name is Brenda Chen. I'm the certified Mandarin interpreter. 16 17 THE COURT: Please, be seated. 18 MS. CHAUDHRY: Your Honor, is your mic on? 19 THE COURT: It is. If you would like to draw closer, 20 you may. 21 I would like to hear from the government on the status 22 of discovery. 23 MR. FINKEL: Yes, your Honor. 24 So, as of today, the government has produced 25

approximately 10 terabytes of data, a bit more than 1.4 million

files, and over 2 million pages. We have produced approximately 37 electronic devices that have been extracted pursuant to search warrants. The government estimates that we will substantially complete our production in the next two to three weeks with the exception, your Honor, of the devices that were seized on March 15th, 2023. The logistics of extracting and processing those devices for production will take somewhat longer. We are going to be producing those on a rolling basis, in fact we expect to produce an additional 16 devices, hopefully by the end of this week. But, to complete all of those devices, we anticipate it will take up to eight weeks.

We also note, your Honor, that our investigation is ongoing and we expect to be acquiring additional materials as we continue to investigate. We will, of course, produce those materials as is appropriate to do so on a rolling basis.

THE COURT: Are there any applications?

MR. FINKEL: So, your Honor, in terms of the order of business for today, I think that the Court, if it chooses to do so, should set a pretrial motion schedule and potentially a trial date. With respect to a trial date, the government estimates a case-in-chief of approximately four weeks. We anticipate that the defense, but don't know for sure, that the defense will also have a case which obviously would extend the length of a trial.

The government is sort of looking at, of course

according to the Court's availability and schedule, the second week in March. We think that would enable enough time for discovery to be completed, the defense to review the discovery, and the defense to file any pretrial motions. In addition, your Honor, with respect to pretrial motions as we have notified your clerk, the government would ask to submit its ex parte CIPA brief on December 15, 2023.

THE COURT: The Court will not be able to start trial until April the 8th and you are expecting about four weeks for the case-in-chief.

From the defense, would you be able to make an April 8 date for trial?

MR. COOK: Yes, your Honor, we could make an April 8 date, however we would request the earliest possible trial date. My client wants a speedy trial and would request a trial date along the lines of what we proposed to the Court earlier in April.

THE COURT: I am setting the trial for April 8. How long do you think your portion would last?

MR. COOK: Two to three weeks, your Honor.

THE COURT: All right.

With respect to a CIPA motion, you have requested what date for submission?

MR. FINKEL: December 15, your Honor.

THE COURT: You shall submit that by December 15th.

Anything further, further applications?

MR. FINKEL: Well, your Honor, the government would move to exclude time until April 8, and in addition, ask that the Court set a pretrial motion schedule for the defense for pretrial motions, motions other than motions in limine in advance of trial. The government believes such motions should be scheduled to be submitted by the defense in the fall, to make sure there is enough time for the government to respond to what it expects to be voluminous motions, and the Court has had an opportunity to review them and, if necessary, schedule a hearing.

THE COURT: When can you have your motions ready?

MR. COOK: Your Honor, I believe November 15th would be sufficient time.

THE COURT: How long for the government's opposition?

MR. FINKEL: Your Honor, the government asks for three weeks.

THE COURT: All right, then. So the opening brief on November the 15th; opposition papers on the 6th of December; and the reply on the 20th of December.

Anything further?

MR. COOK: Yes, your Honor.

We filed a letter motion regarding laptop access to discovery for our client. It is currently pending before your Honor. We have served the Bureau of Prisons. We just wanted

to raise the issue with your Honor, we have discussed it with the government. We intend on having further discussions with the Bureau of Prisons, however we believe that it would be helpful in those discussions if we had some sense from the Court that access to a laptop for both the defendants while in BOP and MDC, given the volume of discovery, would be deemed appropriate. I am not asking for an advisory opinion but just a sense from the Court that that would be permissible.

THE COURT: I will hear from the government.

MR. FINKEL: So, your Honor, we defer to the Court in terms of what the Court prefers here. The government has engaged with BOP and helped facilitate communications between the defense and BOP and will continue to do so.

We understand from BOP that there are several procedures that defendants should undertake before laptops are provided, that's BOP's position. The government will help ensure that the defense can facilitate those steps in order to reach the point, if at all, that a laptop should be provided.

So our view, your Honor, is we take no position on this, other than we will continue to help the defendants and their counsel facilitate access to discovery in BOP.

THE COURT: So you are asking for something which is outside of the normal BOP protocol?

MR. COOK: Correct, your Honor. The BOP procedure, as we understand it, first of all, is they simply decline those

requests unless it is immediately prior to trial for purposes of reviewing 3500 material. That will not be sufficient time for my client to review the voluminous discovery in this case. In addition, they require a showing, as I understand it, of inability for my client to sufficiently review material on the MDC provided computer. That will take time. Apparently they want to show that over a period of weeks he has been unable to access it sufficiently. We know already it is not sufficient and we are trying to expedite the process.

THE COURT: I am persuaded by what you have said and so I am going to grant the application.

MR. COOK: Thank you, your Honor.

THE COURT: Anything further?

MR. FINKEL: There are two other agenda items.

First, your Honor, defendant Wang filed a motion for bail yesterday, I believe. The government would like until June 20th to respond to that. We discussed that with Ms. Chaudhry. I don't believe there is objection to it.

Ms. Chaudhry, I understand, would also like an opportunity to reply. And then the second piece of business, your Honor, is the government moves to exclude time until April 8, 2024, so that the defendants may have an opportunity to review discovery, prepare for trial, contemplate motion practice, and discuss potential dispositions with the government.

THE COURT: So is it the case that you don't oppose

the opposition papers from the government on the 20th of June?

MS. CHAUDHRY: Correct, your Honor.

THE COURT: And when you would you like to reply?

MS. CHAUDHRY: One week after that; the 27th, please.

THE COURT: So, the government shall submit its opposition papers by the 20th of this month and the reply is due on the 27th.

Any objection to my excluding time through April 8, 2024?

MR. COOK: Mr. Kwok does oppose, will not waive time.
MS. CHAUDHRY: Likewise.

THE COURT: So, I am excluding time under the Speedy

Trial Act through April 8, 2024. I find that the ends of

justice served by excluding such time outweigh the interests of

the public and the defendants in a speedy trial because this

will allow time for the prosecution to finish producing

discovery, for the defense to consider it, to file motions, and

for the parties to discuss a possible disposition.

That brings an end to our conference, I wish everyone good health.

Did you have an application?

MS. CHAUDHRY: Yes, your Honor. I just wanted to be clear that for efficiency's sake the parties discussed before the application made by Mr. Cook regarding the laptop was for both defendants.

```
N665kwoC
               THE COURT: Yes.
1
               MS. CHAUDHRY: Thank you.
2
3
               THE COURT: It applies to both.
 4
               MS. CHAUDHRY: Thank you.
5
               THE COURT: All righty, then. The matter is
      adjourned.
6
 7
                                     000
8
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
```